

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Thu Feb 06 22:49:12 1997
Received: (from wd5ivd@localhost) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) id WAA17149 for tapr-bb@tapr.org; Thu, 6 Feb 1997 22:49:11 -0600 (CST)
From: Greg Jones <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Message-Id: <199702070449.WAA17149@tapr.org>
Subject: [TAPR-BB:302] Digital Web-based Directory is real (fwd)
To: tapr-bb@tapr.org (TAPR-BB mailing)
Date: Thu, 6 Feb 1997 22:49:11 -0600 (CST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL25]
Content-Type: text

Sender: Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>
Subject: Digital Web-based Directory is real

After less than 24 hours since the TAPR NADSD team sent notice to the 65 registered data providers that the on-web site was ready for uploading data, many States now have data ready for you to view on the TAPR Web site. It is exciting to see the terrific interest in this project - and the immediate response of so many database keepers and digital coordinators. To each of you - a BIG thanks.

If you haven't visit the web site, take a few minutes to browse around at <http://www.tapr.org/directory>

Also, a BIG thanks to TAPR President Greg Jones, WD5IVD who has had the vision and drive to carry this project forward. Behind the scenes, Greg has created the database, entered all the group info and established the directories for each group. This project would not have happened without him. Thanks, Greg!

Since the data providers have no limits on how often they up-date their info, you should periodically check for new listings in the areas you are interested in.

Oh yes we still need people to provide data. Look over the participants State list - if there is no coverage shown in your area, please consider registering and becoming a NADSD data provider. See the web site for details.

The only problems we have discovered have resulted from providers not following the field definitions described on the web site. The database looks for things at a particular place and in a specific sequence - anything else results in your listings looking badly.

We look forward to seeing your data on the North American Digital Systems Directory (NADSD).

Best Wishes
The TAPR NADSD Team

Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Fri Feb 14 18:59:16 1997
Received: (from wd5ivd@localhost) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) id SAA24357 for tapr-bb@tapr.org; Fri, 14 Feb 1997 18:59:15 -0600 (CST)
From: Greg Jones <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Message-Id: <199702150059.SAA24357@tapr.org>
Subject: ARLB008 Comments needed, Little LEO
To: tapr-bb@tapr.org (TAPR-BB mailing)
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 18:59:15 -0600 (CST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL25]
Content-Type: text

Forwarded message:
Subject: ARLB008 Comments needed, Little LEO
From: w1aw@arrl.org
Organization: American Radio Relay League
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 19:12:57 EST

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB008
ARLB008 Comments needed, Little LEO

ZCZC AG08
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 8 ARLB008
>From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT February 14, 1997
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB008
ARLB008 Comments needed, Little LEO

Commercial satellite interests seeking access to bands below 1 GHz--including amateur allocations at 146 and 430 MHz--now have added 220 MHz to their ''wish list.'' For the first time, Little LEO (low-earth-orbiting satellite) interests have proposed including 219-225 MHz in their list of desired allocations for the non-voice, non-geostationary (NVNG) mobile-satellite service (MSS). The move was contained in the industry's so-called ''flexible allocation proposal,'' delivered at the February 13, 1997, meeting of FCC Informal Working Group (IWG) 2A. Little LEO targets now include 146 to 148, 219 to 225 and 430 to 450 MHz. The ARRL and AMSAT were among those objecting to the concept, and the League is urging those who agree with their position to comment to the FCC by March 4. IWG-2A has been preparing draft proposals for the 1997 World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-97). These will be reviewed during a March 5 meeting of the FCC's WRC-97 Industry Advisory Committee that is preparing draft proposals for consideration by the United States as it gets ready for WRC-97

The ARRL and AMSAT statement said the latest proposal affecting amateur allocations in the 219 to 225 MHz segment came ''at the last

possible moment'' and ''without any technical support whatsoever.'' The League and AMSAT pointed out that the little LEO proponents have had more than a year to complete a technical study of the possibilities of sharing with the amateur services in the 144 to 148 MHz and 420 to 450 MHz bands. ''They have not demonstrated compatibility for sharing these amateur bands but over the evolution of their document have proposed various 'new ideas' for use of these bands.''

The little LEO flexible allocation strategy for WRC-97--submitted as IWG-2A/86 (Rev. 6)--is to propose broad allocations. The apparent theory is that most administrations would find reasons to oppose little LEO use of specific bands in the crowded spectrum below 1 GHz, but that a broad allocation would permit different implementations in different countries depending on local circumstances.

At the February 13 meeting, a coalition of spectrum interests--including land mobile, amateur, broadcasting, and military--opposed the flexible allocation concept on three grounds: that the concept is simply an invention to avoid performing technical sharing studies that would demonstrate the unfeasibility of sharing; that it is inconsistent with decades of ITU allocations practices; and that, if adopted, the concept would be counter to US interests. The coalition document is identified as IWG-2A/107.

The ARRL and AMSAT submitted a further statement of opposition, citing the absence of any technical studies that might support sharing with the amateur service or the amateur-satellite service and pointing out that the little LEOs have completely mischaracterized the nature of ITU Resolution 640 regarding the use of certain amateur bands in the event of natural disasters. The ARRL/AMSAT paper, revised to reflect opposition to the late proposal to include 219-225 MHz, is identified as IWG-2A/108 (Rev. 1).

Amateurs also might find interesting the comments of the Department of Defense, identified as IWG-2A/101 (Rev. 1). These address the 430 to 450 MHz segment the Little LEOs seek to share.

Anyone wishing to register support for the ARRL/AMSAT submission should send a brief e-mail message to wrc97fcc.gov. The Subject line should say ''Reference No. ISP-96-005 IWG-2A.'' A simple statement to this effect, ''I support the ARRL/AMSAT opposition to the NVNG MSS flexible allocation proposal,'' will be included in the public record and will help to drive home the point that there is broad-based opposition to poorly conceived sharing proposals.

Please note. The proposals the League opposes are not FCC proposals, nor are they endorsed by any other branch of the government. They are industry proposals. The League's objective is to demonstrate there is broad citizen opposition to the industry proposals, so the government will not adopt them as US proposals. So, please don't ''flame'' the FCC if you comment.

Additional arguments or evidence also is welcome. Important. Comments

should reach the FCC no later than March 4, 1997.

The complete ARRL/AMSAT opposition statement and other comments will be posted by February 15 on the ARRLWeb page, <http://www.arrl.org/> under Band Threat News.

NNNN

/EX

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Tue Feb 18 19:21:33 1997

Received: from [192.168.1.2] (knezek2.coe.unt.edu [129.120.111.42]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id TAA29251 for <tapr-bb@tapr.org>; Tue, 18 Feb 1997 19:21:25 -0600 (CST)

From: Greg Jones <wd5ivd@tapr.org>

X-Sender: wd5ivd@tapr.org

Message-Id: <v0300780faf30026258db@[192.168.1.2]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 19:06:22 -0600

To: "TAPR-BB list mailing" <tapr-bb@tapr.org>

Subject: THE FCC, INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS AND ACCESS CHARGES

THE FCC, INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS AND ACCESS CHARGES

This fact sheet offers informal guidance on an issue that has generated a great deal of public interest. For more specific details about the proceedings currently before the Commission, please visit our web site (<http://www.fcc.gov/isp.html>) or public reference room or call our duplicating contractor for a copy of CC Docket Numbers 96-262, 94-1, 91-213 and 96-263.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has requested public comment on issues relating to the charges that Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and similar companies pay to local telephone companies.

On December 24, 1996, the FCC opened a proceeding to reform the system of interstate access charges. Each long distance telephone call you make includes per-minute fees that your long distance carrier pays to the originating and terminating local telephone companies over whose facilities that call also travelled. Those fees, which are designed to recover the costs to local telephone companies for use of their facilities, are referred to as "access charges."

As part of this proceeding, the FCC sought comment on the treatment of ISP and other "enhanced service providers" that also use local telephone companies' facilities. Since the access charge system was established in 1983, enhanced service providers have been classified as "end users" rather than "carriers" for purposes of the access charge rules, and therefore they do not pay the per-minute access charges that

long-distance companies pay to local telephone companies.

This issue is being considered on two different tracks.

I. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Access Charge Reform

The Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) on Access Charge Reform seeks comment on proposals to restructure the entire system of access charges paid to local telephone companies. The Commission is seeking to make the access charge system more consistent with the development of local competition in the telephone industry, and with principles of economic efficiency.

As part of this process, the Commission considered whether enhanced service providers, such as ISPs, should be required to pay interstate access charges. The Commission tentatively concludes that ISPs should not be subject to access charges as currently constituted.

If you want to learn more about this issue you should read paragraphs 282 through 290 in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the rest of the document covers other issues). You can also access this document on the FCC's Web site, or you can obtain this section of the document by calling our fax on demand system at 202/418-2830 and requesting document numbers, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213 and 96-263.

The final deadline for comments on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is Friday, February 14, 1997.

You can submit formal comments by delivering or mailing five copies to: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20554. You can also send informal comments via email. If your email concerns the question of whether Internet and other enhanced service providers should pay access charges, it should be addressed to isp@fcc.gov. If your email concerns other issues in the Access Reform NPRM, it should be addressed to access@fcc.gov.

II. Notice of Inquiry On Internet and Interstate Information Services

In a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) launched with this same Access Reform proceeding, the FCC is seeking to identify what policies would best

facilitate the development of the high-bandwidth data networks of the future, while preserving efficient incentives for investment and innovation in the underlying voice network. The NOI does not make any specific proposals, but seeks comment generally on the implications of information services such as Internet access for the telephone network.

If you want to learn more about this issue you should read paragraphs 311 through 318, the NOI contained within the Access Reform document. You can also obtain this document from the FCC's Web site, or you can obtain this section of the document by calling our fax on demand system at 202/418-2830 and requesting document numbers, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, and 96-263.

The deadline for comments on the Notice of Inquiry is March 24, 1997. Reply comments, submitted in response to the initial round of comments, will be accepted through the close of business on April 23, 1997.

You can submit formal comments by delivering or mailing five copies to: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20554. You can also send informal comments via email by addressing them to isp@fcc.gov.

Frequently Asked Questions on Internet Services and Access Charges

Q: Does the FCC regulate the rates charged by Internet Service Providers (ISPs)?

A: No. ISPs are considered "enhanced service providers" under FCC rules. The FCC does not regulate the rates that enhanced service providers charge to their subscribers.

Q: How does the FCC regulate the rates that local telephone companies charge to ISPs?

A: ISPs purchase local phone lines so that customers can call them. Under FCC rules, enhanced service providers ISPs are considered "end users" when they purchase services from local telephone companies. Thus, ISPs pay the same rates as any other business customer, and these rates are set separately in each state. By contrast, long-distance companies

are considered "carriers," and they pay interstate access charges regulated by the FCC.

Q: How are access charges different from the rates ISPs pay now?

A: Today, ISPs typically purchase "business lines" from local phone companies. Business lines usually include a flat monthly charge, and a per-minute charge for making outgoing calls. Because ISPs receive calls from their subscribers rather than making outgoing calls, ISPs generally do not pay any per-minute charges for their lines, which is one reason many ISPs do not charge per-minute rates for Internet access. Access charges, by contrast, include per-minute fees for both outgoing and incoming calls. The rate levels of interstate access charges are also in many cases higher than the flat business line rates ISPs pay today.

Q: Have local phone companies requested authority from the FCC to charge per-minute rates to ISPs?

A: Since 1983, there has been an ongoing debate about whether enhanced service providers should be required to pay access charges, based on the contention that these companies use local networks in the same manner as long-distance carriers. In June 1996, four local telephone companies (Pacific Bell, Bell Atlantic, US West, and NYNEX) submitted studies to the FCC concerning the effects of Internet usage on these carriers' networks. The companies argued that the existing rate structure did not reflect the costs imposed on local telephone companies to support Internet access, and that Internet usage was causing congestion in part of the local network. In connection with these studies and other pleadings, several local phone companies have asked the FCC for authority to charge interstate access charges to ISPs, although they have not filed a formal petition for rulemaking.

Q: Is the FCC considering allowing local phone companies to impose access charges on ISPs?

A: The FCC has requested public comment on whether ISPs should pay current access charges, and more generally on how Internet and interstate information services that use local telephone networks should be treated. The FCC's initial proposal is that ISPs should not be required to pay current access charges, but the Commission has made no final decisions.

Q: On what issues is the FCC asking for public comment?

A: In the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the FCC is asking for comment on whether ISPs and other enhanced service providers should pay the access charges now paid by long-distance companies.

In the Notice of Inquiry, the FCC is asking for comment on how to create incentives for companies to make the most efficient use of the telephone network for Internet and other information services, and on the impact of different rate structures for ISPs on network usage and deployment of new technologies.

For more specific questions, see the Access Reform document itself. The NPRM and NOI are part of the same document, which is available on the FCC Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov/isp.html>.

Q: What is the difference between a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) and a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)?

A: A NOI is the earliest step in the FCC's process and typically asks questions in an effort to gather enough information to make informed proposals on a given topic. A NPRM is a request for comment on specific proposals made by the Commission. After the FCC reviews the comments filed in response to an NPRM, the FCC can issue a Report and Order adopting new rules.

Q: Is the FCC worried about the effects of different pricing structures on the ISP industry, and on usage of the Internet?

A: Yes. The Commission expressed concern about the effects that imposition of access charges could have on the competitive ISP marketplace, and also noted that the Internet would likely not have grown so rapidly in recent years if most users had been required to pay per-minute rates for Internet access. At the same time, local telephone companies have argued that per-minute rates would more accurately reflect the costs that ISPs impose on the network, and would provide sufficient revenues to fund network upgrades needed to more efficiently handle data traffic.

Q: What are the deadlines for filing comments?

A: For the NPRM, which asks whether ISPs should pay current access charges, the final deadline is February 14, 1997.

For the NOI, which asks for comment more generally about the implications of Internet and interstate information services, the comment deadline is March 24, 1997, and the reply deadline is April 23, 1997.

Please note that both sets of deadlines have been moved back from what was originally established in the Access Reform document released in December 1996, in response to petitions for extensions of time to file comments.

Q: How do I file comments on this issue?

A: You can submit formal comments by delivering or mailing five copies to: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20554. Your comments must include the docket numbers, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, and 92-253. More information on filing formal comments is available on the FCC Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov/ccb/>.

Because of the importance of these issues to the Internet community, the FCC has also established an email box for informal comments at isp@fcc.gov.

Q: Will comments filed by other parties be available for review?

A: Formal comments are available for review in the FCC Reference Center in Washington DC. In addition, we will make available on the FCC Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov/>; any copies of formal comments we receive in electronic form.

Q: Is the FCC considering "surcharges" or "taxes" for use of the Internet or online services?

A: No. The FCC has sought comment on whether ISPs should be treated as end users or carriers, and has proposed initially to keep the current system in place. The debate involves charges levied by local phone companies, not government taxes.

Q: Is this the "FCC modem tax" that has been floating around the Internet in various forms for several years?

A: The "modem tax" referred to a proposal in 1987 to require enhanced service providers to pay interstate access charges, which at that time were significantly higher than they are today. The 1987 proposal was abandoned in 1988. The current Access Reform proceeding is entirely separate, and the FCC has specifically proposed not to require enhanced service providers to pay access charges.

Q: What is the next step in the process?

A: The Commission will review the comments filed in response to the NPRM and NOI. The FCC has expressed its intention to issue a Report and Order on reforming the interstate access charge system by May 1997. As for the NOI on Internet and interstate information services, the record does not close until late April. Based on that record, the Commission will decide whether at a later date to issue an NPRM seeking comment on specific proposals. The Commission also held a public forum on Access and Bandwidth on January 23, 1997, in order to more fully address questions relating to the implications of Internet services for the telephone network. The transcript of the forum and related materials are available on the FCC Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov/bandwidth/>.

Last Updated 2/14/97

--

~~~~~  
Dewayne Hendricks, WA8DZP ! AOL: HENDRICKS  
Warp Speed Imagineering ! Internet: dewayne@warpspeed.com  
Fremont, CA 94539-3204 ! WWW: <<http://www.warpspeed.com/>>  
~~~~~

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Wed Feb 19 14:47:31 1997
Received: from [192.168.1.2] (knezek2.coe.unt.edu [129.120.111.42]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id OAA29694; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 14:47:25 -0600 (CST)
From: Greg Jones <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
X-Sender: wd5ivd@tapr.org
Message-Id: <v0300781eaf3115ba15ba@[192.168.1.2]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 14:41:03 -0600
To: "TAPR-BB list mailing"<tapr-bb@tapr.org>
Subject: Reply Comments on Access Charges Reform NPRM now available

Reply comments on the FCC's Access Charges Reform NPRM 96-488 are now available online at:

<http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common_Carrier/Comments/access_reform/replycomments.html>

--

~~~~~  
Dwayne Hendricks, WA8DZP ! AOL: HENDRICKS  
Warp Speed Imagineering ! Internet: dwayne@warpspeed.com  
Fremont, CA 94539-3204 ! WWW: <<http://www.warpspeed.com/>>  
~~~~~

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Wed Feb 19 15:16:40 1997
Received: from [192.168.1.2] (knezek2.coe.unt.edu [129.120.111.42]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id PAA01425; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 15:16:34 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <v03007823af31194fed8d@[192.168.1.2]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 15:08:30 -0600
To: "TAPR APRS SIG" <aprssig@tapr.org>,
"TAPR-BB list mailing" <tapr-bb@tapr.org>
From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Subject: GPS-20 Group Purchase Update

TAPR still needs another 15 units purchased to get to the magic order point.

If you think you will be wanting a MIC-E or TAC-2 kit in the next few months when they are available, then get that GPS-20 now to interface internally with the kit. We figure it might be summer before another group purchase is completed for those who might want one for their MIC-E or TAC-2 kits.

check <http://www.tapr.org/gps> for the full details on the GPS-20 purchase.

Latest info on the MIC-E is at <http://www.tapr.org/tapr/html/mic-e.html>

Latest info on the TAC-2 is at <http://www.tapr.org/tapr/html/tac2.html>

Cheers - Greg

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Fri Feb 21 14:11:35 1997
Received: from [208.134.134.40] ([208.134.134.40]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id OAA14189; Fri, 21 Feb 1997 14:11:28 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <v03007807af33ae228ec1@[208.134.134.40]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 13:57:34 -0600
To: "APRS SIG list mailing" <aprssig@tapr.org>,
"TAPR-BB list mailing" <tapr-bb@tapr.org>

From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Subject: TAPR GPS-20 Group Purchase

The required number of orders has now been placed for the GPS-20 purchase.

The group purchase will be placed with Garmin sometime next week after all the charges to account have been made and the money is available for withdraw.

I'll post a followup when we have a delivery date from Garmin.

Cheers - Greg

Greg Jones, WD5IVD
Austin, Texas
wd5ivd@tapr.org
<http://www.tapr.org/~wd5ivd>

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Fri Feb 21 14:11:41 1997
Received: from [208.134.134.40] ([208.134.134.40]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id OAA14196; Fri, 21 Feb 1997 14:11:31 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <v03007808af33aeafafe6@[208.134.134.40]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 13:59:13 -0600
To: " TAPR/AMSAT DSP "<dsp@tapr.org>, " DSP-93 Build "<dsp-93@tapr.org>,
"HF SIG list mailing"<hfsig@tapr.org>,
"TAPR-BB list mailing"<tapr-bb@tapr.org>
From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Subject: PC DSP Software Group Purchase

This is to let those who were in the PC DSP Software Group purchase know that the software has arrived and is being shipped.

Cheers - Greg

Greg Jones, WD5IVD
Austin, Texas
wd5ivd@tapr.org
<http://www.tapr.org/~wd5ivd>

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Tue Feb 25 18:52:29 1997
Received: (from wd5ivd@localhost) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) id SAA15593 for tapr-bb@tapr.org; Tue, 25 Feb 1997 18:52:29 -0600 (CST)
From: Greg Jones <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Message-Id: <199702260052.SAA15593@tapr.org>
Subject: [TAPR-BB:311] [FCCREG:572] FCC R/O 2330 MHz (fwd)

To: tapr-bb@tapr.org (TAPR-BB mailing)
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 18:52:28 -0600 (CST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL25]
Content-Type: text

Sender: wd5ivd@tapr.org
Subject: [FCCREG:572] FCC R/O 2330 MHz

Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 17:02:31 -0600 (CST)
From: Brad Wyatt <bwyatt@arasmith.com>
Subject: [TAPR FCCREG:572] FCC R/O for Pacific Division 2330 MHz Alert Team
X-Comment: Tucson Amateur Packet Radio FCC Reg Discussions

Latest news as of 2PM PST, Feb. 25, 1997, on the 2305-2310 Mhz.
reallocation and auction NPRM --

To those of you on the Pacific Division 2300 MHz Alert List --- This
bulletin and the rest of the information should also be found on the
ARRL Pacific Division Home Page on WWW at pdarrrl.org ---

As you all remember, Congress authorized the auction of 2305-2310 MHz of
the Amateur Band at the close of Congress in Oct. 1996. The FCC issued
an NPRM in this matter in November 1996 -- Comments due Dec. 4, 1996;
and Reply Comments due on Dec. 16, 1996.

The FCC issued a Report and Order on Feb. 19, 1997, on this matter.
The FCC created the Wireless Communications Service (WCS) and a new Part
27 to the FCC rules. They also changed Part 97 as indicated below. As
you can see they didn't take 2305-2310 MHz away from the ARS as had been
feared. Also, note the references to Amateur Radio use of 2390 - 2450
MHz.

Please also note that this Report and Order does NOT include any action
on the ARRL petition submitted to elevate our status to primary in
2300-2305 Mhz. That petition is still pending.

The Report and Order is very long and complex, dealing with WCS, but the
relevant parts dealing with Part 97 follow:

36. Finally, in the NPRM, we proposed to permit amateurs to continue to
use the 2305- 2310 MHz band on a secondary basis. We also proposed to
permit continued flight test and vehicle launch use of the 2310-2320 and
2345-2360 MHz bands on a secondary basis. We are adopting these
proposals. The effect of this action is that amateurs and aeronautical
telemetry operations will be able to continue to use these bands so long
as these operations do not interfere with WCS service. In addition, we
update and clarify the frequency sharing requirements for [74] amateur
use of the 2300-2310 MHz and adjacent bands [75]. We also clarify that
footnotes US276 and US339 permit the use of various frequencies for
telemetering and associated telecommand operations of launch vehicles
"on a co-equal basis by Government and non-Government stations." With
respect to Primosphere's request that all flight test operations be

precluded from [76] the WCS bands, we find no basis for precluding such operations on a secondary basis. We make clear that if secondary flight test operations cause harmful interference to WCS operations, they must immediately either correct the problem or cease operations. If such operations prove to be a problem, however, we may re-evaluate this issue in the future.

[75] Specifically, we update 47 C.F.R. 97.303(j)(1) in order to inform the amateur community that amateur stations may not cause harmful interference to, nor are they protected from interference due to the operation of, mobile stations authorized in Region 1 (this is in addition to fixed operations). We also revise 47 C.F.R. 97.303(j)(2) in order to better alert amateurs of their spectrum sharing responsibilities.

PART 97 -- AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE

1. The authority citation for part 97 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: 48 Stat. 1066, 1082, as amended; 47 U.S.C. sections 154, 303. Interpret or apply 48 Stat. 1064-1068, 1081-1105, as amended; 47 U.S.C. sections 151-155, 301-609, unless otherwise noted.

2. Section 97.303(j) is revised to read as follows:

97.303 Frequency sharing requirements.

* * * * *

(j) In the 13 cm band:

(1) The amateur service is allocated on a secondary basis in all ITU Regions. In ITU Region 1, no amateur station shall cause harmful interference to, and shall be not protected from interference due to the operation of, stations authorized by other nations in the fixed and mobile services. In ITU Regions 2 and 3, no amateur station shall cause harmful interference to, and shall not be protected from interference due to the operation of, stations authorized by other nations in the fixed, mobile and radiolocation services.

(2) In the United States:

(i) The 2300-2305 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a secondary basis. (Currently the 2300-2305 MHz segment is not allocated to any service on a primary basis.)

(ii) The 2305-2310 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a secondary basis to the fixed, mobile, and radiolocation services.

(iii) The 2390-2400 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a

primary basis.

(iv) The 2400-2402 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a secondary basis. (Currently the 2400-2402 MHz segment is not allocated to any service on a primary basis.) The 2402-2417 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a primary basis.

The 2417-2450 MHz segment is allocated to the amateur service on a co-secondary basis with the Government radiolocation service. Amateur stations operating within the 2400-2450 MHz segment must accept harmful interference that may be caused by the proper operation of industrial, scientific, and medical devices operating within the band.

This material is courtesy of Dewayne Hendricks, WA8DZP, Pacific Division Assistant Director and TAPR Regulatory Chairman.

More details will be sent to the Pacific Division 2300 MHz Alert Team and posted on the Pacific Division Home Page as soon as they are known.

Contact Brad Wyatt, K6WR, Pacific Division Director at k6wr@arrl.org or (408) 395-2501 if you can help in any way.

73, Brad Wyatt K6WR ARRL Pacific Division Director